

The scaling of conductance in the Anderson model of localization in one dimension is a two-parameter scaling

Jean Heinrichs*

Institut de Physique, B5, Université de Liège, Sart Tilman, B-4000 Liège, Belgium

The cumulants of the logarithm of the conductance ($\ln g$) in the localized regime in the one-dimensional Anderson model are calculated exactly in the second Born approximation for weak disorder. Only the first two cumulants turn out to be non-zero since the third and fourth cumulants vanish identically and the higher cumulants are of higher order in the disorder. The variance and the mean of $\ln g$ vary linearly with length L while their ratio is proportional to the inverse localization length. The resulting exact log-normal distribution of conductance thus corresponds to a special form of two-parameter scaling. This contradicts the standard one-parameter scaling in the random phase approximation.

PACS numbers: 71.55.Jv, 72.15.Rn, 05.40.-a, 42.25.Bs

The appearance of the scaling theory of localization in d -dimensional disordered systems [1] and more detailed developments of it in 1D [2, 3, 4, 5] and for quasi 1D systems [6, 7] has inaugurated a golden age for mesoscopic physics. This is demonstrated by the numerous review articles [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] and monographs [14, 15] dealing with application of scaling ideas to transport in disordered conductors.

The fundamental hypothesis in the scaling theory [1] is that the scaling of the logarithm of a typical conductance g as a function of a characteristic size L of the system is described asymptotically for large L by a universal function, $\beta(\ln g)$, of a single parameter (SPS), namely $\ln g$ itself:

$$\frac{d \ln g}{d \ln L} = \beta(\ln g) \quad . \quad (1)$$

The function β which may generally depend on dimensionality is independent of L and of any microscopic parameter in the system. We recall that in the studies of scaling in 1D systems [2, 3, 4, 5] the parameter $\ln((1 + \rho))$, with $\rho = \frac{1}{g}$ the resistance, was identified as the convenient scaling variable both in the low resistance ($\rho \ll 1$) (quasi-metallic) regime and in the large resistance or insulating regime ($\rho \gg 1$). This variable reduces to $-\ln g$ in Eq. (1) for $\rho \gg 1$ (localized regime) and, thanks to the Landauer formula, $\rho = \frac{r_L}{t_L}$ (with r_L and t_L the reflection and transmission coefficients of the system, respectively), it coincides with $-\ln t_L \simeq -\ln g$.

In Refs. [2, 3, 4, 5] on 1D systems it was argued that the scaling theory of Abrahams et al. [1] had to be interpreted in terms of the scaling of the distribution $P_g(g)$ of the random conductance of the system. SPS then means that $P_g(g)$ is fully determined by a single parameter such as e.g. the mean logarithm, $\langle -\ln g \rangle$, which is itself defined by a scaling equation of the form (1) with $\ln g$ replaced by $\langle \ln g \rangle$.

The validity of SPS in the theory of Abrahams et al. [1] has generated debates and controversies in the past, which have not been fully settled and which have recently been revived [16, 17, 18]. Indeed the justifications of the SPS hypothesis in the analyses [2, 3, 4, 5] rests on the use of a random phase approximation (RPA) which assumes that the phases of the amplitude reflection- and transmission coefficients R_L and T_L (with $r_L = |R_L|^2$, $t_L = |T_L|^2$) are uniformly distributed over $(0, 2\pi)$ in the localization domain, which corresponds to length scales L much larger than the localization length ξ . Although strong evidence, both numerical [19] and analytical [20, 21], exists for uniform phase distributions for $L \gg \xi$ in the 1D Anderson model [22], the controversy about the validity of SPS does not seem to be satisfactorily resolved [16, 17, 18, 23]. However, Cohen et al. [23] have concluded that if RPA was not used one would obtain at most two-parameter scaling. Doubts about the RPA results have led Deych et al. [16] to reconsider the scaling problem in the framework of an exact solution for the Lloyd model, which differs from the Anderson model by the use of a Cauchy distribution of site potentials. While the study of the Lloyd model does not allow to draw conclusions for scaling in the Anderson model (because the Cauchy distribution possesses infinite moments), the results of Ref. [16] do show that the phase randomness model is invalid for the Lloyd model. On the other hand, Schomerus and Titov [17] have studied the deviations of the conductance distribution from the SPS form obtained in the RPA at the band centre ($E = 0$). They also discussed [17, 18], using large deviation statistics, the higher cumulants which, beyond the mean and the variance, affect the exact distribution of conductance.

The purpose of the present paper is to calculate exactly the distribution of conductance in the localization regime ($L \gg \xi$) in the current 1D Anderson model for weak disorder. We feel that, in particular, our results definitely clarify the status of the SPS hypothesis in the Anderson model.

The Schrödinger equation for a chain of N disordered sites $1 \leq m \leq N$ of spacing $a = 1$ ($L = N$) is

$$\varphi_{n+1} + \varphi_{n-1} + \varepsilon_n \varphi_n = E \varphi_n \quad , \quad (2)$$

where the site energies ε_n , in units of a constant hopping rate, are independent gaussian variables of zero mean and correlation

$$\langle \varepsilon_m \varepsilon_n \rangle = \eta^2 \delta_{m,n} \quad . \quad (3)$$

The disordered chain is connected as usual at both ends to semi-infinite non-disordered chains ($\varepsilon_m = 0$) with sites $m > N$ and $m < 1$, respectively.

The distribution of the transmission coefficient t_N (conductance) for an electron incident from the right with wavenumber $-k$ (or energy $E = 2 \cos k$) will be obtained by using the general recursion relations of Ref. [21] which connect the transmission- (reflection-) amplitudes of a chain of n sites with the corresponding amplitudes for a chain with one less disordered site of length $n - 1$. By iterating the transmission amplitude recursion relation (11.a) of [21] we readily find

$$\ln T_N = i k N - \sum_{n=1}^N \ln[1 - i \nu_n (1 + e^{2ik} R_{n-1})] \quad , \quad (4)$$

where the reflection amplitudes are given by Eq (11) of [21]

$$R_n = \frac{e^{2ik} R_{n-1} + i \nu_n (1 + e^{2ik} R_{n-1})}{1 - i \nu_n (1 + e^{2ik} R_{n-1})} \quad . \quad (5)$$

with

$$\nu_n = \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2 \sin k} \quad (6)$$

The Eq. (4) is our starting point for studying the cumulants of $\ln t_N = \ln T_N + \ln T_N^*$ and its probability distribution.

For weak disorder (small ε_m) we restrict the analysis to low order in the correlation parameter η^2 . Since the variance of $\ln t_N$ is found to be proportional to η^4 to lowest order an exact treatment for weak disorder must involve expanding (4) to 4th order in the site energies. In parallel our analysis requires the reflection amplitudes in (5) to second order in the disorder, that is in the second Born approximation of backscattering. Since R_m is linear in the site energies to lowest we expand it in terms of linear and quadratic contributions, $R_m = R_m^{(1)} + R_m^{(2)}$, which are defined by recursion relations obtained by identifying contributions of the same order in an expansion of both sides of (5):

$$R_n^{(1)} = e^{2ik} R_{n-1}^{(1)} + i \nu_n \quad , \quad (7)$$

$$R_n^{(2)} = e^{2ik} R_{n-1}^{(2)} + 2i \nu_n e^{2ik} R_{n-1}^{(1)} - \nu_n^2 \quad . \quad (8)$$

Solutions of (7-8) will be used for extracting explicit forms of successive order terms up to fourth order in the expansion of $\ln t_N$ obtained from (4),

$$\ln T_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{p=1}^4 (-1)^{p+1} \frac{u_n^p}{p} \quad , \quad u_n = -i \nu_n (1 + e^{2ik} R_{n-1}) \quad . \quad (9)$$

At this point we have to determine the relevant asymptotic solutions of (7-8) for describing transport in the strong localization regime, $N \gg \xi$. In this domain the transport is dominated by the amplitudes R_n at large scales n ,

which are described by some invariant distribution [8], which is independent of the initial values at sites where the iteration of (5) was started. On the other hand, the probability densities associated with R_n and R_{n-1} , respectively, are related by a linear integral equation defined from the recursion relation (5). Since for large n these densities are invariant it follows that in the recursion relation (5) we may replace R_{n-1} by R_n in this limit. Then we obtain from (7-8)

$$R_n^{(1)} = \frac{i\nu_n}{1 - e^{2ik}} \quad , \quad (10)$$

and

$$R_n^{(2)} = \frac{\nu_n}{1 - e^{2ik}} \left(\frac{2\nu_{n-1}}{1 - e^{-2ik}} - \nu_n \right) \quad , \quad n \gg \xi \quad . \quad (11)$$

The existence of an invariant density for large n is a general property which is equivalent to the random Oseledec theorem [24] (a review on these aspects and of their application in weak disorder studies is found in [25], see also [26]).

Using (9-11) we express the powers of $\ln t_N$, $(\ln t_N)^n$, $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$ to 4th order in the site energies (powers higher than 4 have only contributions of higher order in the site energies) in order to find the moments, using (3). In performing the averages we make use of the factorization property

$$\langle \varepsilon_m \varepsilon_n \varepsilon_p \varepsilon_q \rangle = \langle \varepsilon_m \varepsilon_n \rangle \langle \varepsilon_p \varepsilon_q \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_m \varepsilon_p \rangle \langle \varepsilon_n \varepsilon_q \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_m \varepsilon_q \rangle \langle \varepsilon_n \varepsilon_p \rangle \quad , \quad (12)$$

valid for arbitrary indices m, n, p, q different or not [27]. A useful simplification is also to note that averages of the form $\langle \nu_n R_{n-1}^{(1,2)} \rangle$ vanish because $R_{n-1}^{(1,2)}$ depends only on energies of sites $m \leq n-1$. By straightforward but somewhat cumbersome calculations we obtain the following final results for the moments:

$$\langle \ln t_N \rangle = -2\gamma N \quad , \quad \gamma = \frac{\eta^2}{8 \sin^2 k} - \frac{\eta^4}{64 \sin^4 k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2 \sin^2 k} \right) \quad , \quad (13)$$

$$\langle (\ln t_N)^2 \rangle = \frac{\eta^4}{16 \sin^4 k} (N^2 + 3N) \quad , \quad N \gg \xi \quad , \quad (14)$$

$$\langle (\ln t_N)^n \rangle = O(\eta^6) \quad , \quad n \geq 3 \quad , \quad (15)$$

which are exact within the second Born approximation. The vanishing of the $n = 3$ and $n = 4$ moments (Eq. (15)) through order η^4 results from the fact that the fourth order terms in both $(\ln t_N)^3$ and $(\ln t_N)^4$ cancel identically. Finally from (12) and (13) we get for the second cumulant of $\ln t_N$:

$$\text{var } \ln t_N = \frac{2\eta^4 N}{16 \sin^4 k} = 12\gamma^2 N + O(\eta^6) \quad , \quad (16)$$

and higher cumulants defined e.g. in [27] vanish to fourth order, of course.

In discussing the above results we first note that $\gamma = \xi^{-1}$ in (13) is nothing but the perturbation expression for the inverse localization length, in which the leading term coincides with the well-known expression in the (first) Born approximation [28]. Our results for the cumulants of $\ln t_L \simeq \ln g$ in the localized regime ($N \gg \xi$) show that the distribution of the conductance has an exact log-normal form in the second Born approximation, namely

$$P(g)dg = \frac{1}{\sqrt{24\pi\gamma^2 N}} e^{-\frac{(\ln g + 2\gamma N)^2}{24\gamma^2 N}} d \ln g \quad . \quad (17)$$

The important new feature of the exact result for the variance in (16) is that while being linear in N , in agreement with the central limit theorem, the ratio of it to the mean (13) is proportional to the inverse localization length. In this case the criterion for SPS [16], which is obeyed in RPA, is clearly violated. This shows that the mean and the

variance of $\ln g$ in the distribution (16) act as distinct parameters even though they obey the same scaling equation of the form $\frac{df}{d\ln g} = f$, $f = \langle \ln g \rangle$ or $\text{var} \ln g$. In this sense our exact analysis demonstrates two-parameter scaling in the localized regime of the Anderson model, in contrast to the RPA which leads to a strictly SPS [2, 3, 4, 5].

Our analytical results for the cumulants of $\ln g$ differ qualitatively from the results for the 1D Anderson model obtained by Schomerus and Titov (ST) [17], who did not use RPA. ST find that at the band center ($E = 0$) the first three cumulants differ from zero and are proportional to $\langle \ln g \rangle$, which indicates that the distribution of $\ln g$ obeys a SPS. Furthermore, for large energies ST recover the SPS results of RPA [17]. We believe that the differences between our results and those of [17] originate in the fact that we are using an exact analysis of the discrete Anderson model whereas the treatment of ST deals with a continuum limit of the tight-binding equations. In particular, the disorder enters in our analysis via the reduced site energies (6) depending on the Bloch wavenumber k at energy $E = 2 \cos k$. On the other hand, the length scale dependence of successive moments in (13-15) enters, quite distinctly of the disorder parameters ε_n , via multiple summations over sites of the form (4). In contrast, in the Fokker-Planck type continuum treatment of ST the disorder enters exclusively via a rescaled length and a reduced continuum energy, which causes the cumulants at $E = 0$ to depend on the rescaled length only (via $\langle \ln g \rangle$).

Finally, we note that the observed shortcoming of the RPA conductance (resistance) distribution in the localized regime exists also in the well-known DMPK equation for the distribution of transmission eigenvalues in quasi 1D systems [6, 7]. This is because the DMPK equation reduces in the 1D limit to results obtained in the RPA.

* Electronic address: J.Heinrichs@ulg.ac.be

- [1] E. Abrahams, P.W. Anderson, D.C. Liailardello and T.V. Ramakrishnan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 673 (1979).
- [2] P.W. Anderson, D.J. Thouless, E. Abrahams and D.S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **B22**, 3519 (1980).
- [3] A.A. Abrikosov, Solid State Comm. **37**, 997 (1981).
- [4] V.L. Mel'nikov, Sov. Phys. Solid State **23**, 444 (1981).
- [5] N. Kumar, Phys. Rev. **B31**, 5513 (1985).
- [6] O.N. Dorokhov, JETP Lett. **36**, 319 (1982).
- [7] P.A. Mello, P. Pereyra and N. Kumar, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **181**, 290 (1988).
- [8] B. Shapiro, Phil. Mag. **B56**, 1031 (1987).
- [9] See the collection of review articles in Mesoscopic Phenomena in Solids (Ed. B.L. Altshuler, P.A. Lee and R.A. Webb, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991).
- [10] B. Kramer and A. MacKinnon, Rep. Prog. Phys. **56**, 1469 (1993).
- [11] J.B. Pendry, Adv. Phys. **43**, 461 (1994).
- [12] C.W.J. Beenakker, Rev. Mod. Phys. **69**, 731 (1997).
- [13] M. Janssen, Phys. Rep. **295**, 1 (1998).
- [14] Y. Imry, Introduction to Mesoscopic Physics (Oxford University Press, 1997).
- [15] K. Efetov, Supersymmetry in Disorder and Chaos, (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- [16] L.I. Deych, A.A. Lisiansky and B.L. Altshuler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2678 (2000); Phys. Rev. **B64**, 224202 (2001).
- [17] H. Schomerus and M. Titov, Phys. Rev. **B67**, 100201 (R) (2003).
- [18] H. Schomerus and M. Titov, cond-mat/0302148.
- [19] A.D. Stone, D.C. Allan and J.D. Joanopoulos, Phys. Rev. **B27**, 836 (1983).
- [20] J. Heinrichs, J. Phys.: Condensed Matter **2**, 1559 (1990); Solid State Comm. **76**, 543 (1990).
- [21] J. Heinrichs, Phys. Rev. **B65**, 075112 (2002).
- [22] The invariant imbedding model studied in [20] has recently been shown [21] to be equivalent to the continuum limit of the tight-binding Anderson model for weak disorder.
- [23] A. Cohen, Y. Roth and B. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. **B38**, 12125 (1988).
- [24] V.I. Oseledec, Trans. Moscow Math. Soc. **19**, 197 (1968).
- [25] J.M. Luck, Systèmes Désordonnés Unidimensionnels (Alea, Saclay, 1992).
- [26] B. Derrida and E.J. Gardner, J. Physique **45**, 1283 (1984).
- [27] See e.g. N.G. Van Kampen, Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981).
- [28] D.J. Thouless, in Ill-Condensed Matter, edited by R. Balian, R. Maynard and G. Toulouse (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979). We identify η^2 with the second moment, $\frac{W^2}{12}$, of the rectangular distribution of site energies of width W used by Thouless.